

Higher Education

Staff Notes

The Higher Education Advisory Committee members heard a presentation by Ann Coles, Senior Vice President for College Access at The Education Resources Institute (TERI). Coles discussed the primary goal of the Pathways to College Network, to advance college access and success for under-served students. Coles presented strategies for helping youth successfully transition into post-secondary education and training.

Next the committee members heard a presentation by Lili Allen, Program Director for Jobs for the Future, an organization that works to strengthen society by creating educational and economic opportunity for those who need it most. Allen presented strategies for helping low-skilled adults enter and succeed in college, including organization around one-year credentials, and the creation of a longitudinal student record system.

Questions and comments related to these presentations included:

- The importance of community colleges for students who can't afford to move
- Providing many re-entry points back into education and training
- Generational and cultural attitudes towards school
- Literacy is at the root of drop-out rates

Next, Ann Daley, Dave Spangler and Libby Street updated the committee on the process and outcome of determining the external consultant, and why NORED was chosen. The committee will have a working relationship with the consulting team throughout the course of the study.

The committee spent the rest of the day in their sub-groups, funding, enrollments, and transitions.

Funding Work Group

In attendance: Chris Alejano, Jim Bricker, Ann Daley, Roy Flores, Roberta Greene, Sally Jewell, Rep. Phyllis Kenney, Sarah Reyneveld, Dave Spangler, John Warner, Harlan Patterson (UW), Mary Alice Grobins (SBCTC), Violet Boyer (ICW), Terry Teale (COP), Bruce Botka (HECB)

The funding group listened to a presentation that included a Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) Cost Study Overview and a Cost of Attendance Overview led by Harlan Patterson, and Mary Alice Grobins.

The presentation provoked a discussion around the scope and limitations of the HECB report. The group agreed that it was important to determine the total umbrella cost of education, including operating and capital cost. The group reinforced its intention to develop options for a higher education funding system.

The outcome of the discussion was a list of deliverables. The understanding was that NORED would be responsible for providing reports to the committee on the following items.

Deliverables:

Determining the Cost of Education

- Cost of instruction
- Capital funding costs and other costs not included in the "Cost of instruction" definition
- Data review—determine cost of funding of peer institutions and compare to Washington state institutions, recognizing that the peers may be different for each
- Review of private institutions cost of funding and potential options in solving higher education demand

Develop options for a higher education funding system

- Recommend cost sharing methodology
- Determine appropriate share of funding from the state, institution, student and federal government
- Determine appropriate level of WA State graduates in economy vs. recruits from outside of the state
- Review other state models and their consequences
- Examine other practices regarding differential tuition and/or fees by program (for example, charging significant fees for higher cost programs; assessing whether or not it is appropriate to charge more for fields where earnings potential is higher; determine whether programs in high demand for the state's economy should be subsidized to support demand)

The group also discussed big picture items and possible obstacles to achieving deliverables.

BIG ISSUES/ OBSTACLES:

Governance

- Understand Washington State laws (RCW)
- Timing of institution budgets with state appropriations
- Roles of 3 Boards - HECB, SBCTC, WFTB
- Consider recommendations to improve effectiveness and efficiency of higher ed governing structure
- Don't let the controversial topic of governance dominate the funding discussion

The group agreed that it was also important to establish primary funding responsibility for each major program category. It was recognized that “one size does not fit all” and different programs should be funded in different ways. Programs to be reviewed include:

- Adult Basic Education
- GED/Remedial/Developmental
- Community and Technical College programs
- 4 year BS/BA (at comprehensives and research universities)
- High demand programs
- Graduate

The group listened to a presentation by Violet Boyer on the Cost of College Project sponsored by the National Association of College and University Business Officers. (see <http://www.nacubo.org/documents/research/instructions.pdf>)

The group discussed the proposal on the table by the chair to attend the January 12th meeting of the Steering Committee. It was agreed by those members present that the members of the funding committee would attend the Steering Committee meeting on January 12th in lieu of the scheduled Higher Education Advisory Committee meeting on January 24th. It was decided that as many members as possible would come to the meeting of the Steering Committee on January 12th to hear the presentation by NORED beginning at 9 a.m. From 12:00-2:00 the Higher Education Advisory Committee would have a scheduled working session with NORED.

Items for the next work group meeting (January 12th) include:

- Meeting with consultant and Steering Committee

Items for the February 21st work group meeting include:

- Meeting with consultant
- Develop workgroup plan
- Key timeline and deliverables

Enrollment Work Group

The enrollment subgroup's meeting on 12/19 consisted of two sessions. In the morning, the group heard presentations from three groups on reports concerning workforce demand and the supply of graduates sufficient to meet that demand.

The HECB's Randy Spaulding discussed the HECB needs assessment report, and concluded that the state would need to accommodate an additional 45,000 students by 2012. Bryan Wilson of the WTECB and Loretta Seppanen of the SBCTC discussed their findings in the joint report that was distributed to work group members. Their conclusion is that the state is producing enough BA degrees in total, but serious gaps remain in certain fields (health care, engineering, computer science). They also found that the state is not producing enough graduates with 'mid-level training,' defined as over one year, but less than baccalaureate level (associates degrees, certificate programs, etc.).

Andi Smith of the HECB discussed the fact that different regions of the state face different challenges. The Northwest region, the Tri-County region, Eastern region and Southwest Washington regions have the greatest disparity from the state average in terms of participation in higher education and training. Growth 'pressure points' due to workforce demand and population growth include the North Snohomish/Skagit county region, King County and Southwest Washington.

Finally, David Wallace of the Employment Security discussed the findings of the quarterly 'Job Vacancy Survey', which found high demand for employees with bachelor's degrees, especially in the King County region. In fact, the report highlighted the extremely high percentage of total job vacancies in the state that are located in King County. Furthermore, King County employers are looking for more educated employees than the rest of the state.

These technical advisors also wanted the group to keep community/technical college enrollments in mind when discussing BA enrollment; that is, to remember that many people in the two-year system intend to transfer, and that these people are in effect de facto baccalaureate students. They also emphasized a point made in the November meeting: keep returning students in mind too. Colleges don't just cater to recent high school graduates - they serve working adults too.

The second session was occupied with planning the groups' next meeting. The group decided:

- To meet on January 24th as planned, and not to cancel the meeting in favor of attending the Steering Committee meeting on January 12.
- To clarify the philosophical basis that underpin the group's work and recommendations - the group needs to elucidate a statement of principles so that the rest of the group understands how and why decisions and recommendations were made.
- To use a revised version of the document Ray sent out on December 12th to frame the group's work, and to use in discussions with the new higher education researchers, who should be at the meeting on the 24th.

In the afternoon of the 24th, the group plans to tackle a number of issues:

- Looking beyond job forecasts to target specific growth sectors within the economy (we're working on getting a report on this from the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development)

- Investigating strategies for encouraging students to enroll in high demand programs like computer science - in short, how do we manage key 'gaps' in the educational supply?
- To hear presentations on enrollment allocations from the SBCTC and from budget staff from the legislature and the executive.
- Discuss how higher ed should respond to growth in the non-traditional student population
- Start to examine new and different delivery models for education, and how certain schools are moving beyond a traditional, brick-and-mortar approach.

Transitions Work Group

Work Group Members: Michael Pavel, Tim Stensager, Libby Street, Robert Segura, Bernal Baca, Diana Mamerto-Holz; Dana Richardson (Staff)

Technical Advisors: Carol Jenner, OFM; Cindy Morana, Council of Presidents; Kyra Kester, OSPI; Sally Zeiger-Hansen, SBCTC

Guests: Lili Allen, Jobs for the Future; Ann Coles, Pathways to College Network, TERI; Madeleine Thompson, Workforce Board; Michelle Stender, Counsel, Senate Republican Caucus; Bjorn Danielson, Antioch College; Melissa Heaton, Gates Foundation; Gray King, WEA; Sid Sidorowicz, City of Seattle

Deliverable: Recommendation on Dual Credit

Recommendations: There seemed to be uniform agreement that these dual-credit options provide enhanced opportunities for all students to be exposed to and successful in college. Evidence suggests, though not enough data are available in Washington State to confirm, that each dual credit option may benefit segments of the population that other don't and that the range of options is a strength of the state's system. There is already evidence that tech-prep students come to believe that they can be successful as a result of their participation and some actually complete their tech-prep certificate simultaneous with completing their high school diploma. There is reason to believe that other dual-credit options will have the same affect on students' beliefs about their potential. There was widespread agreement among working group members that a better data collection system would be helpful in confirming the suspicion that Running Start and CHS serve different segments of the population.

Summary of Policy/Procedures Issues

- a. Ensure that dual credit programs intersect with guidance, mentoring, and communication initiatives such as Navigation.
- b. Identify other dual credit programs that could benefit students in the state.
- c. Improve access to AP tests for all students.

- d. Improve early identification. (We have low PSAT and pre-ACT participation rates.) Can we build systems to improve this? (WASL helps some; how do schools make sure that students who do well on 7th grade WASL stay connected.)
- e. Develop policies that can assist in focusing resources?
- f. Achieve legislative language that provides fiscal support for CHS
- g. Develop a data collection system that will provide demographic data on those who participate
- h. Ensure that students and their parents understand the multiple opportunities for dual credit.
- i. Continue research on all options to ensure quality; specifically research CHS to determine comparability of student learning in high school compared to those who take similar classes in college setting, impact of CHS participation on college participation rates, and impact of CHS on improved readiness for college.
- j. Identify mechanisms that inform teachers, students, and parents about what it means to be college ready and make this information a key professional development component for those involved in guidance.

Draft Position Statements/Recommendations

The work group supports

- 1. An array of HS-IHE dual credit/enrollment options, and
 - a. Encourages ensuring access and opportunity for all students, particularly ensuring that students of color participate
 - b. Encourages the state to expand opportunities to meet the needs of all students.
 - c. Requests more detailed descriptions of the currently available five options and how they're different: when dual credit; when dual enrollment; when class taken and test results determine whether credits are earned.
 - d. Supports the work of OSPI, SBCTC, HECB, and COP to establish guidelines for college in the high school and to garner legislative support for a funding formula that will support these programs.
 - e. Agreed that each option for dual credit should have clear operational guidelines (MOUs, contracts)
- 2. A comprehensive guidance system for all high school students that includes
 - a. Mentoring
 - b. Communication to students and parents
 - c. Parental Involvement (K-12)
 - d. Clear Advising

- e. Staff Development
 - f. Coordination between high school and post secondary education
 - g. Information about dual credit options.
3. A commitment that all students who complete high school will be prepared for post secondary options.
 - a. How will it connect with high school plans?
 - b. Where do I want to go and how do I get there?
 4. Collaboration and professional development between K-12 and post-secondary systems.
 - a.
 5. Complementing all transition programs with a strong marketing campaign that effectively communicates to students and their families.
 - a.
 6. A state-wide integrated data collection and analysis system related to HS-IHE dual credit programs.
 - a.

The work group will have a conference call sometime prior to the January 24 meeting at which time members will review and refine these recommendations.